

# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

---

VOL. I.

FEBRUARY, 1921.

No. 2.

---

## A Series of Lenten Addresses.

Delivered at the American Theater, St. Louis, March 1—5, 1920.

REV. H. B. HEMMETER, Rochester, N. Y.

---

Jesus:

### I. The Light of the World.

JOHN 8, 12.

Less than a hundred years ago one of the world's greatest thinkers is reported to have exclaimed upon his deathbed: More Light. He had lived in a so-called Christian country, had been reared in the Christian religion, and had made the customary professions of the Christian faith in his early youth. In the battle of life, however, with its passions and its emotions he had lost most of his Christian character, had delved deep into the Pyrean spring of human learning, and though admittedly one of the colossal minds of all ages, with a knowledge of earthly wisdom, of the ways, the feelings, and the experiences of men such as few men ever had, on his deathbed the great Goethe had to cry out for more light. In the presence of death he was enshrouded in darkness.

About four thousand years ago there lived in a far eastern country, among Gentile peoples, a man who is described in Sacred Writ as perfect and upright, one that feared God and eschewed evil. He had been blessed by God in family, in riches, in friends. But under a permissive providence of God all was taken from him, and with his own body wasting away with putrefying sores, and his own wife tilting him with the advice to "bless God and die," old Job is portrayed as lifting up his voice, and with a vision that transported his believing soul, is recorded to have exclaimed: "I know that my Redeemer liveth."

Nearly two thousand years ago there lived in Jerusalem, the

sacred city, a man, just and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel. It had been revealed unto him by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death before he had seen the Lord's Christ. And coming by the Spirit into the Temple when the parents brought in the Child Jesus to do for Him after the custom of the law, he took Him up into his arms, blessed God and said: "Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation, which Thou hast prepared before the face of all people; a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of Thy people Israel."

These three instances exemplify the truth of the words of Jesus of Nazareth when He says: "I am the Light of the world; he that followeth Me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life."

Job, surrounded by Gentile people, with the vision of the Messiah promised by God from the beginning, with the faith that enclosed the coming Redeemer from sin and all of sin's dire consequences, with a hope that enlightened his life, in the presence of impending death, has light, yes, the light of life. Simeon with the Christ-child in his arms, with the faith once delivered unto the saints in his heart, in the valley of the shadow of death fears no evil, but invites death, having the light of life. But Goethe, surrounded by Christian communities, but without Christ, in spite of all earthly learning, is in darkness, and in the presence of death cries out for "more light."

The world without Jesus is in darkness.

Without Jesus the world is in intellectual darkness. It does not understand man's origin, his end, or aim. It does not know him as the object of the Maker's love, beloved even after man's rebellion. It does not know man as God's beneficiary of the universe, the heir of mansions prepared for him before the foundations of the earth were laid. Jesus only sheds that light.

Without Jesus the world is in moral darkness. Thanks to a benevolent Maker the world still has a sense of right and wrong, by reason of the Law written in the human heart, still has a moral balance, called conscience, though rusted much by lack of use. But under the deluding influence of the Prince of Darkness, this moral sense with its balance is not at all reliable. Our times have emphasized this fact nigh beyond belief. Every law of God as well as every law of man was violated whenever it conflicted with momentary worldly interests. Humanity, the law of love for friend as well as foe, was ridiculed, the duty of justice and of mercy was



held in contempt. And in this darkness the world nigh perished. It cannot be otherwise. Without Jesus the world has no real knowledge or perception of that righteousness which is properly a part of the image of God in man, that righteousness which is primarily a matter of the heart, the root of righteous thoughts, and words, and acts. Without Jesus the world is ignorant of its real duty toward God and man, and in its moral darkness cannot reach the lofty heights that commend mercy "because your Father in heaven is merciful," that insist that we "love our enemies," pray for them, and, if needs be, die for them. Jesus only sheds that light.

Without Jesus the world is in spiritual darkness. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God, they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned." The world is by nature blind in the matters that are spiritual. Without Jesus the world cannot discern, cannot believe, the things that human eye hath not seen, the things that God hath prepared for them that love Him. "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Jesus, lifted up on the cross, alone can draw all men unto Himself, can shed the light that enlightens the human heart, that warms it, and out of its regenerated soil brings forth the good fruits of Christian faith.

Yes, Jesus is the Light of the world.

It is out of the realization of this fact, the fact that Jesus is the world's intellectual, moral, and spiritual light, that Isaiah, in view of Jesus' coming shouts to his people: "Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. For, behold, darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people, but the Lord shall arise upon thee, and His glory shall be seen upon thee. And Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising."

This being so, should Christians not continually dwell in that light? And since Jesus Himself has said: "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of Me," should Christians not be fervent students of that Word? We cannot live our natural lives without the natural sun, its light; how can we hope to live our spiritual lives without Jesus, the Light of the world? We need Him. We need our Bibles.

And again, Jesus being the Light of the world, should we, who have come to that Light, not show forth the praises of Him who hath called us out of darkness into His marvelous light? The world needs Him, for still it is true, "the Light shineth in darkness,

and the darkness comprehendeth it not." How great is the world's unrest in these our days! Should we not minister to the world's great needs? Jesus alone can shed the light that can enlighten, and warm, and heal the world's great wounds. Let the Light shine.

Jesus:

## II. The Bread and the Water of Life.

JOHN 6, 48; 4, 14.

A vast multitude had followed Jesus. They had been miraculously fed with bread and with fishes. They would make Jesus their king. They had followed Him over the Sea of Tiberias, they shrank from no labor to find Him, for He had been their bodily benefactor.

Jesus, who knew what was in man and needed not that any man should tell Him, said to them: "Verily, verily I say unto you, Ye seek Me not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled." Then Jesus added: "Labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you; for Him hath God the Father sealed." John 6, 26. 27.

And then follows that remarkable dissertation in which Jesus presents Himself as the Bread of Life of which, if any man eat, he shall never hunger more.

A woman approaches Jesus at the well of Samaria. She is seeking water. Jesus converses with her and in the course of that conversation tells her: "If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith unto thee, Give Me to drink; thou wouldest have asked of Him, and He would have given thee living water," and: "Whosoever drinketh of this water that I shall give unto him shall never thirst." John 4, 11. 14.

In these two texts Jesus stands before the world as the Bread and the Water of Life."

As to the meaning of these words, there can be no doubt. They are clear in the places where they are found. Jesus is the spiritual nourishment and refreshment of the soul. The sacred Book abounds in evidences of the experience of their truth. One of the most beautiful of these we find in the 23d Psalm, the Psalm of Jesus the Good Shepherd. In its first verses we read: "The Lord is my Shepherd; I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures, He leadeth me beside the still waters. He restoreth my soul, He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake. Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for Thou art with me,



Thy rod and Thy staff, they comfort me." David had found the Messiah, and He was to him the spiritual Bread and the Water of Life to nourish and to refresh his immortal soul.

The human soul needs food. It needs it as really as the body needs its food. Every faculty of the soul, the understanding, the will, the affections, cry out for their food for their sustenance, for their strengthening, for their development. Without its food the soul hungers and thirsts.

But where outside of Jesus is there satisfaction for the human soul? Man at all times has recognized the soul's unstilled yearnings; has sought to define it and to find its rest. The human eye has searched, and the human ear listened; every human sense has sacrificed itself in the service; but the soul's hunger has never thus been stilled, its thirst never thus been quenched. All earthly treasure, all gold and silver and their equivalents cannot satisfy the soul. Earthly pleasure, the world's giddy pastimes and its sensualities, cannot satisfy the soul. Earthly pomp and glory, this world's choicest honors, cannot satisfy the soul. Yes, if it were possible for man to gain the whole world, he might with it all yet lose his soul.

Where, then, is the soul's true satisfaction? Nowhere there among the things for which the world so much labors. The food of this world is all perishable, and its water lacks the life that abides. The soul yearns for something better.

Our texts point to Him who alone can satisfy the human soul.

The soul yearns for God. Consciously or unconsciously it joins in the words of the Psalmist: "As the hart panteth after the waterbrooks, so panteth my soul after Thee, O God." Jesus reveals God. Yes, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." Jesus has declared God to man as the heavenly Father, who, though He hates sin, yet loves the sinner; as the God, who "so loved the world, that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life"; as the God who for Jesus' sake, for the sake of Jesus' suffering and death, forgives man's sin, declares man just and righteous. Yes, Jesus has declared God as a Father who feels with us in all our infirmities, earthly woes, and sorrows, will hear us if we cry to Him, will help us and eventually completely save us. Jesus has revealed God to us as a God of love.

Thus declaring God, Jesus satisfies the human soul. Beholding God by faith in Jesus Christ the soul is satisfied.

The soul hungers and thirsts after righteousness; a righteousness that is real, that is perfect. Jesus reveals it. Himself the great Prophet, Jesus reveals Himself as the great High Priest who once and for all entered into the Holy Place to render a satisfaction for the sin of the world. He is the High Priest that is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, who knew no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth. By His own and active obedience He approved Himself the Righteous One. And then He "offered up Himself" for the sin of the world. "With His stripes we are healed." Yes, Jesus is made unto us of God "righteousness."

Thus revealing Himself, Jesus satisfies the human soul. Beholding Jesus the soul is satisfied.

The soul yearns for rest; rest in the full sense of the term. The soul yearns for rest in itself. Jesus conveys it. Having declared God to the world, having died for the world, Jesus the risen Savior addressed His disciples, saying: "Peace be unto you." What peace? Peace with God, indeed. But more than this; peace within our souls. Yes, Jesus conveys the "peace of God that passeth all understanding," the joy that no man taketh from us.

Offering and conveying that peace, Jesus satisfies the human soul.

We are living in a time of great unrest. The world seems to be rocking in its very foundations. What is the real cause of it all? Reach down deep into the world's uneasiness, its lovelessness, its hopelessness. What is at the bottom of it all? Is it not the restlessness of the human soul that has lost its bearings, has lost its place in the everlasting arms of God? What is our duty then? Knowing Jesus as the Bread and the Water of Life that satisfies the soul, what else than this: to minister to the world according to its great need. Partaking ourselves more and more of Him, it should be our Christian occupation to preach Jesus to the world. Him hath God the Father sealed; He bears the stamp of the world's unimpeachable Food Commissioner.

### III. "I Am the Vine, Ye Are the Branches."

JOHN 15, 5.

These words were spoken by Jesus on the night in which He was betrayed. They were spoken presumably in that upper room in Jerusalem, where for the last time during His earthly ministry for our salvation He had drunk of the fruit of the vine, where He had eaten with His disciples the last Passover of the Old Covenant, and where He instituted the Passover of the New Covenant



in which He gives us His body to eat and His blood to drink for the forgiveness of sin and for the sealing of our faith in Himself as our Deliverer from death.

These words express an intimate relation between Jesus and His disciples. In fact, they indicate an organic spiritual connection between Jesus and the believer. Paul expresses the same fact when he pictures the believers as the body whose spiritual head is Jesus. Jesus and His disciples are most intimately and closely related.

And this relation is constant. Jesus says: "*I am the Vine, ye are the branches.*" The sap of the vine flows continually into the branches; the strength of Jesus is constantly communicated to His disciples. Jesus supplies all spiritual power, is the Author and the Finisher of our faith in the fullest sense of the words, supplies all real fruitfulness, enables us to live the life of Christian fellowship with Him.

The figure of our text, therefore, is most interesting and instructive.

In the first place it emphasizes the fact that in Christian discipleship Jesus is always *first and fundamental*. First Jesus, then the branches. Jesus the Foundation, then the spiritual superstructure. Our text thus visualizes all that which is presupposed in Biblical Christianity. It refers back to the time of which John says: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." It refers back into the very arcanum of the divine decree that determined to "put enmity" there where Satan would put harmony, to crush the power of the Evil One, by the suffering and the death of the "Woman's Seed." This text includes all that was written by the prophets concerning the Son of Man, of His innocent suffering and death. It refers the spiritual vision to the act of God of which Jesus Himself spoke when He said: "God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." It presupposes the sacrificial death of Jesus for the sin of the world; in short, the Jesus of the Bible. It presupposes Jesus of whom the Scriptures say: "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid," Jesus. He is the Vine; without Him there can be no branches. Jesus is first and fundamental in that great communion of saints that hopes to be saved through Him in the final judgment.

This is of the greatest importance in our day in connection with those movements that intend or involve the breaking down

of the confessional bars in the Christian Church's activity of evangelizing the world. The so-called community church that opens its gates to all on the basis of a mere confession of good will, that presupposes no confessional basis concerning Jesus, His person or His work, that in other words insists on no denial of error or of self, but involves a denial of Jesus as the Savior of the world, this so-called church violates the very first principle of Christ's Church on earth. It attempts to grow branches without the vine.

The figure of our text further stigmatizes the apostasy of a large part of nominal Christianity of our day. Many call themselves Christian, both individuals and churches, and yet deny the Christ that bought them. They deny the divine Jesus, the representative atonement, the efficacy of the Sacraments, in fact, every distinctively Christian doctrine, and yet appropriate the name of Jesus. In other words, they sacrifice the Vine, and still insist that they be branches.

In the second place our text emphasizes the fact that the disciples are always secondary and relative. First Jesus, then the believer. But, the branches being united with the vine, they are secondary only to the vine and in that relationship represent its strength, its power, its influence. The life of the vine pulsates in the branches and all of its mysterious and refreshing fruitfulness is exercised and manifested through those branches. Cut off the branch, and it is dead; but connected with the vine and maintained in healthy growth, all the vine's effectiveness is alive and active in the branch.

In this light we must understand the complaint of our day, now so frequently heard, that the Church has lost its power. To be sure, the Church and every Christian lose their power in the proportion that they lose Jesus. In the proportion, therefore, that the Church removes Jesus from its pulpit and substitutes other themes, no matter how attractive and even generally necessary, in that proportion the Church loses Jesus, His power and His influence. The church, however, that with the apostle can say, that in its Christian ministry to the world it has determined to know nothing save Jesus, and Him crucified, that church has not lost its power, the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. That church, moreover, is still the real salt of the earth, the world's best seasoner and preservative.

Moreover, the branches being secondary and relative to the vine, Jesus, it follows that the believers on earth are capable of doing the work to them entrusted. Theirs is the greatest mission



on earth. They are to preach the Gospel to every creature. They are to oppose and overcome the powers of darkness. The gates of hell are against them. But their power is the power of the vine; all power in heaven and in earth is theirs, for they are secondary and in relation to Jesus, Lord of heaven and earth.

All this being as it is, our text in conclusion again impresses on us the lesson to keep close to Jesus. He is first and fundamental to our Christian life and hope, and our spiritual life is commensurate with our fellowship with Him. Moreover, the Bible being the source of all our spiritual knowledge and faith, it will be well if we again heed Jesus' words when He says: "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of Me."

---

## Confessionalism of the Missouri Synod.

PROF. W. H. T. DAU, St. Louis, Mo.

---

### 3. THE CRITICAL SITUATION IMMEDIATELY BEFORE THE ORGANIZATION OF THE SYNOD.

We protest against the designation "Old Lutherans" that is forced upon us, because, in very fact, there are only Lutherans, that is, such as join in the Lutheran Confession, and non-Lutherans, that is, such as reject, more or less, this *thoroughly* Scriptural, orthodox-churchly Confession; whether they are papists, fanatics, or false brethren, and whether the principal cause of their partial rejection of the truth is the pride of self-righteousness and work-righteousness, as in the case of Romanists, or the pride of haughty carnal reason, as in the case of fanatics and false brethren.

*From Dr. Sihler's review of a report of the organization of the Missouri Synod, November 30, 1847.*<sup>1)</sup>

Within two months after the organization of the Missouri Synod the report of its first convention was submitted to the public. In a review of this publication an Eastern writer introduced the new synod as follows: "This new synod is composed of genuine 'Old Lutherans,' the real, spotless orthodox, whose theology is as strict and straight as the Symbolical Books can make it, and whose acts of worship are as stiff as such thoroughbred old-school folks could desire to have them."<sup>2)</sup> It is this remark that called forth the protest of Dr. Sihler cited at the head of this article. The

---

1) *Der Lutheraner*, Vol. 4, p. 51.

2) Contribution signed "Hermann" in *Luth. Observer*, Vol. 15, No. 1.

remark characterizes the confessional attitude of the writer and of those whom he represented better than that of the Missouri Synod. Nobody in America that was in a position to observe Walther and his followers could reasonably be in doubt regarding the distinctive feature of the new body that was organized at Chicago, Monday, April 26, 1847. The basis and plan of the new organization had been published long before the Chicago convention,<sup>3)</sup> and it was known to all Lutherans in America that the sole reason for organizing a new Lutheran synod was the issue of confessionalism. Chapter 2 of the draft for a constitution of the new body had made this issue both plain and prominent, when it named among the "conditions of membership" the following: "Acceptance of all the Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church" (these were enumerated in detail) "as the pure, unadulterated presentation and exposition of the divine Word; renunciation of all syncretistic church-fellowship, such as, serving union churches" (usually with a Reformed and Lutheran membership) "as such, taking part in the worship and sacramental acts of heterodox and mixed congregations" (unionistic pulpit- and altar-fellowship), "cooperating with heterodox tract- and mission-societies; exclusive use of pure books of worship and instruction in churches and schools (liturgies, agendas, hymn-books, catechisms, readers)."

But for this confessional issue, there are reasons to believe that the organization of the Missouri Synod would have been averted. Not all of the Saxon immigrants, Walther's immediate followers, favored the movement to organize a synod. The settlements in Perry County sent no delegates to the Chicago Convention; Rev. G. H. Loeber of Altenburg alone attended the Convention and joined the Synod as an advisory member.<sup>4)</sup> In Walther's congregation at St. Louis there were long and tedious discussions of the draft of the synodical constitution, which was revised in important points, and of the question whether the congregation should join the Synod.<sup>5)</sup> It was not indifference on the part of these Lutherans that caused them to hesitate, but chiefly the dread of raising up some kind of a hierarchy over the congregations. They were won

3) September 15, 1846; *Der Lutheraner*, Vol. 3, pp. 2—6.

4) Rev. O. Fuerbringer, then at Elkhorn Prairie, Ill., did the same.

5) In the old *Protokollbuch* of Trinity Congregation the minutes for May 11, 18, 22, 25; June 2, 4, 8, 11, 15, 18, 1846; and for January 11; February 1, 16, 22; April 12, 1847, show with what care the plan of the new synod was discussed, and what scruples had to be removed.



for the plan when they realized the confessional issue that was involved in the proposed organization.

It is but fair to say that the confessional issue, and therewith the organization of the Missouri Synod, was forced by the very parties who afterwards denounced it in terms neither charitable, nor just, nor pleasant. To cite a few instances to the point. In 1845 the *Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, in its issue of December 18, published, in the form of a letter addressed to the President of the synod, a notice of withdrawal from membership in the Ohio Synod that involved eight pastors and one teacher.<sup>6)</sup> The reasons for this withdrawal were mainly of a confessional nature. The letter sets forth the following grievances of the parties withdrawing: 1. A conference in Eastern Ohio had, in 1844, laid before the Ohio Synod the question: "Which synods [in America] are Lutheran?" Synod deferred its answer one year, and then tabled the question. This was done while the spokesmen of the Lutheran General Synod, which had called itself the American Lutheran Church, had recklessly repudiated the Lutheran doctrine of the Sacraments, and adopted anti-Lutheran practises of the Methodists. The questioners had hoped that their synod would declare against these aberrations from the Lutheran standards. 2. The unionistic formula of distribution<sup>7)</sup> had been in use in the Ohio Synod, together with an "unchurchly and Calvinistic formula of absolution." The ritual for the ordination of a minister demanded no confessional pledge from the candidate. A request that these defects be removed passed unheeded, and the members of synod were officially recommended the use of the Synod's *Agenda* of 1842, which embodied these un-Lutheran features. 3. Some of the parties signing the letter of withdrawal had previously petitioned their synod to state publicly that the Synod accepted all the Confessions of the Lutheran Church, and pledged itself to the same; to issue a testimony, or declaration against the General Synod's false doctrine on the Sacraments; to institute a thorough reform of the prevailing method of examining candidates for the ministry; to pledge candidates at their ordination to all the Con-

---

6) Rev. Fred. Winkler, Detroit, Mich.; Rev. Dr. W. Sihler, Fort Wayne, Ind.; Rev. A. Schmidt, Cleveland, O.; Rev. J. G. Buerger, Hancock Co., O.; Rev. J. A. Ernst, Neudettelsau, O.; Rev. Andrew Saupert, Evansville, Ind.; Rev. W. Richmann, Bern Township, Fairfield Co., O.; Rev. Aug. Selle, Columbiana Co., O.; Mr. E. A. Schuermann, Pittsburgh, Pa.

7) "Christ says: Take, eat," etc.

fessions of the Lutheran Church; and to cease serving union churches composed partly of Reformed, partly of Lutherans. The report on this petition was remanded to the committee in charge on technical grounds, and led to a withdrawal of the petition by its authors, who asked, as a substitute, that the Synod declare "that *henceforth* at the ordination of ministers there shall be given a solemn pledge to all the Symbols of the Evangelical Lutheran Church." Action on this request was deferred three years. The petitioners inferred from this that the Synod in the majority of its members did not seriously intend to take a definite stand on the confessional issue that had been raised. A minor complaint was that the seminary of the Synod at Columbus had "in a faithless and illegal manner" been deprived of its German character, contrary to the constitution, and this action seemed the more grievous because of the four Lutheran seminaries in the country the Columbus Seminary was the only one with a German character.

In reporting this incident in the issue of *Der Lutheraner* for January 24, 1846,<sup>8)</sup> Dr. Walther remarked: "With profound sadness we communicate to our readers these transactions. They show us, alas! that even in America no denomination has suffered as great a decay as the society of those calling themselves 'Lutheran.' All the sects of our country are more zealous to preserve the false teachings on which their organizations are based and which give them their distinctive character, than the so-called Lutherans of our country are concerned about retaining the holy and pure doctrine based on the clear Word of God, which had been entrusted to them by God's unspeakable grace. Yea, we see that in the American Lutheran Church the prevailing spirit is not only one of negligence and indifference, but of hostility to the true Lutheran Church. It has retained nothing but the name; the old truth and the old spirit of confessorship it has lost.

"However, we also see from the foregoing account that we have no reason to despair utterly of the existence of the Lutheran Church in America. Evidently, God is once more seizing His fan to purge His threshing-floor, and to winnow His wheat. Evidently God has decided to look on no longer at the pilfering of false saints and at their fishing in troubled waters. God is beginning again here and there to open a few eyes that are horrified to behold the defection of which the Lutherans have become guilty. Here and there God is again raising up men who cry aloud that there

---

8) Vol. 2, p. 42 f.



must be a return to the first love which has been forsaken. God be praised: after a long winter the voice of the turtle-dove is again heard in our land!<sup>9)</sup>

"Up, up, then, dear brethren! Let us not idly look on while false brethren are closing their ranks more firmly, to undermine and remove the foundation of our Church. Fighting treacherously under our name, they are more dangerous than our declared enemies: they are our enemies' allies, and yet are in our camp. True, 'He that sits in the heavens laughs at them, and the Lord has them in derision.'<sup>10)</sup> For, 'though the waters of the sea roar and be troubled, though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof. Selah. There is a river, the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God, the holy place of the tabernacles of the Most High. God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved: God shall help her, and that right early.'<sup>11)</sup> However, just as impossible as it is to force Luther's doctrine out of the world, just as easy is it for us, unless we hold fast the faithful Word,<sup>12)</sup> and contend for the faith,<sup>13)</sup> to lose our treasure,<sup>14)</sup> and, in the end, to be rejected as unfaithful stewards.

"Therefore, let us who not only call ourselves Lutherans in hypocritical fashion, but purpose to be and remain such in deed and truth, — let us band together and once more rally around the banner of the old unalterable doctrine of our Church. Let us jointly beseech the Lord to arise and set us in safety from them that puff at us.<sup>15)</sup> Let us join in a faithful confession of the truth. Let us together fight with the sword of the Spirit against all falsifications, and together bear the reproach with which the Lord, as a rule, marks His servants. While we may not hope in these last, horrible times to restore the Church to a flourishing and glorious condition by our testimony, we must not, on the other hand, surrender the hope that our testimony and our contending will not be altogether in vain, but will result in praise for the Lord and turn many a soul from the error of its way."

A similar event in the summer of 1846 took four pastors<sup>16)</sup> out of the Synod of Michigan. These pastors had remonstrated

9) Song of Sol. 2, 11—13.

10) Ps. 2, 4.

11) Ps. 46, 3—5.

12) Titus 1, 9—11.

13) Jude 3.

14) 2 John 8, 9.

15) Ps. 12, 5; Luther translates (v. 6): "Ich will eine Hilfe schaffen, dass man gefrost lehren soll."

16) Rev. W. Hattstaedt, pastor at Monroe, Mich.; Rev. A. Craemer, pastor of a mission congregation at Frankenmuth, Mich.; Rev. Fr. Lochner, pastor at Toledo, O.; and Rev. J. Trautmann, pastor at Danbury, O.

against the admission of Rev. Dumser to the membership of their synod on the ground that he declared an unconditional pledge to all confessional writings a violation of his conscience and refused to give such a pledge. The Michigan Synod itself stood officially pledged to all the confessions of the Lutheran Church, but the majority of its pastors were inclined to tolerate the confessional license of Rev. Dumser. The remonstrants also asked the synod to discontinue its practise of serving union churches as such. Their remonstrance was set aside by a majority vote of the synod in June, 1846, and thereupon they left the Michigan Synod.<sup>17)</sup>

Of the men who passed through these experiences in their synods, Ernst, Sihler, Craemer, Selle, Richmann, Trautmann, and Hattstaedt were among the charter members of the Missouri Synod a year later. Since the entire clerical membership recorded for the first convention amounted to twenty-two pastors, these seven men who had left other synods because of the confessional issue represented nearly one-third of the membership of the new body. Their grievances were, of course, the grievances of every member of the Missouri Synod.

On November 10 — Luther's birthday — 1845, a remarkable document was signed at Gettysburg, Pa.,<sup>18)</sup> which was printed the same year and sent to Germany. Dr. Walther reviewed the contents of this paper January 24, 1846, in *Der Lutheraner*.<sup>19)</sup> He characterizes it as "the General Synod's official avowal of its defection from Lutheran doctrine and from the Lutheran Church." A brief examination of this document will show the justice of Dr. Walther's verdict. The authors, speaking as representatives of the General Synod, declare that they have always regarded as a fundamental principle of Lutheranism the statement with which Mosheim introduces his description of the Lutheran Church, *viz.*, that in the view of this Church every vital duty must be established solely and exclusively from Scripture, and that the Symbolical Books must be subordinated to the Divine Word. This principle, they

---

17) *Der Lutheraner*, Vol. 3, p. 98 ff.

18) By "Dr. S. S. Schmucker, Professor of Theology at the seminary of the General Synod of the Lutheran Church at Gettysburg, Pa.; Dr. B. Kurtz, Editor of the *Lutheran Observer* at Baltimore, Md.; Dr. H. N. Pohlmann, Pastor of the Lutheran Church at Albany, N. Y.; Dr. J. G. Morris, Pastor of the First Lutheran Church at Baltimore, Md.; Rev. H. J. Schmidt, Professor at the seminary at Hartwick in the State of New York."

19) Vol. 2, p. 43 f.



say, has been frequently applied by them in their activity in America. Their synod has required of its members only an essential agreement in doctrinal and ethical views. Its formula for licensing and ordaining ministerial candidates requires that the following promise be given: "We believe that the fundamental truths of the Bible are presented in the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession in a manner essentially correct." Their confessional views they condense in the maxim: "*In fundamentalibus Lutheranismi unitas, in non-fundamentalibus libertas, in omnibus caritas*" ("In the fundamentals of Lutheranism, unity; in non-fundamentals, liberty; in all things, charity"). Appealing to the heterogeneous population of America, they assert that strict uniformity is not attainable here. One must be tolerant of divergent views, be satisfied with the essentials of orthodox teaching, and in regard to Lutheranism practise a liberal eclecticism, and favor a free development of the Church under the peculiar conditions that exist in this country. "As regards our doctrinal views, we do not hesitate to state, yea, we profess emphatically and publicly, that the great majority of us are not Old Lutherans in the sense of a small party in Germany that bears this name. We are convinced that the great Luther himself, if he were still living, would not be an Old Lutheran. We believe that the last three centuries have produced men as able to think, investigate, and construct as those of the sixteenth century. Yea, though we have a humble opinion of ourselves, we are nevertheless bold enough, and our sense of duty urges us, to search the Scriptures for ourselves, and to draw our doctrinal views from this heavenly fountain. Still, we are Evangelical Lutheran. Holding fast the fundamental principle of Luther that God's Word alone is infallible, we have tested Luther's doctrinal system by this principle and found it essentially correct. In most of our ecclesiastical principles we occupy common ground with the union ['unierte'] church of Germany. We do not consider the distinctive views that divide the Old Lutherans from the Reformed essential. The school of the so-called Old Lutherans, it seems to us, is behind the age. The glorious Reformation of the sixteenth century was neither instantaneous nor perfect. The great Luther was progressive as long as he lived, and at the end of his career regarded his work as unfinished. We follow his advice," etc. The writers now proceed to endorse the dogmatical position of Mosheim and Reinhard, repudiate as obsolete Luther's peculiar view of the Lord's Supper, admitting merely a spiritual presence of Christ with believing communicants, and

declare infant baptism to be for the purpose of receiving the infant into the membership of the visible Church. Universalists, whose basis, as a rule, is Socinian, are denounced, but the Methodists are credited with having "done much good." Only their order of service does not suit Germans. Germans who are emigrating to America are advised not to attempt a separate organization, parallel to that of the Evangelical State Church of Germany; for the attempt would ultimately miscarry. There is little hope for a German Lutheranism in America. The *Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* is moribund. The Columbus Seminary, which recently came under the control of Germans and Old Lutherans, has been abandoned by Americans and has suspended operations.

Such were the conditions, viewed from the standpoint of confessional fidelity, in the Lutheran Church of America on the eve of the organization of the Missouri Synod. This new synod simply could not avoid becoming a standing offense, and being regarded as a constant provocation, and an irritant to the older Lutheran synods already existing in this country. The opprobrium that was heaped upon it could have been escaped only by the Missouri Synod's declining to be born; and it can be removed in most instances where it exists to-day only by the Missouri Synod as a confessionally distinct body going out of existence. Possibly this may happen. No visible church has a lease on endless perpetuity. But the vanishing of the name of the Missouri Synod would not remove the real difficulty. That lies in confessionalism. Confessionalism is an expression of a vital faith, and is as indestructible as faith, and the Word of Grace, which produces that faith, and Christ, the Author and Finisher of that faith. As long as this world endures, there will always be champions of God's Word and Luther's doctrine pure, and the trouble which the confessionalism of the Missouri Synod seems to have created will not end till Judgment Day.

Whoever will write the exhaustive history of the American Lutheran Church, we venture to say, will come to a point, about the year 1845, where it would have been easy to form one united Lutheran Church on a genuine Lutheran basis. It was not the fault of the men who were compelled to organize the Missouri Synod that this consummation devoutly to be wished was not achieved.

---



## THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

### Deaconess Association.

In its first annual report (September 1, 1920) the "Lutheran Deaconess Association within the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America" (Office: 2307 Broadway, Fort Wayne, Ind.) reports a membership of 635 individuals and 72 congregations. These contributed \$5,671.51 (plus over \$1,400 not yet returned to the treasurer); the disbursements were \$1,051.47. The report embodies a statement of Rev. J. R. Graebner in the *Lutheran Witness*, on the origin and aim of the Association:—

"In the New Testament we read of deacons. They were church officers appointed to relieve the apostles by caring for the poor and otherwise assisting in church-work. A woman appointed for such work is called a deaconess. Phoebe was one of those. We read of her Rom. 16, 1. 2: 'I commend unto you Phoebe, our sister, which is a servant of the church which is at Cenchrea, that ye receive her in the Lord as becometh saints, and that ye assist her in whatsoever business she hath need of you; for she hath been a succorer of many, and of myself also.' This woman cared for the sick, the poor, the strangers, in the congregation at Cenchrea.

"Church history tells us what noble, self-sacrificing service such women workers performed during the first centuries of the Christian Church.

"When by and by false doctrine and idolatrous practises crept into the Church, and popery became more and more established, the female diaconate gradually changed into nunnery.

"As a fruit of the Reformation, the office of deaconess was again established, especially through the labors of Fliedner at Kaiserswerth and Loehe at Neuendettelsau, Germany, about eighty years ago.

"At present there are about 20,000 deaconesses. The Episcopal, Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, and other churches have such trained female workers. Among Lutheran synods the General Council, the General Synod, and the Augustana Synod have the help of deaconesses in their own charitable institutions and in their mission-work.

"Why not our Synodical Conference? If other church-bodies have deaconess schools in which they train women for assisting pastors and missionaries in their work among the poor, the sick, the needy, the forsaken, the outcasts, both in institutions and in private homes, why should not we have the same?

"There is, and has been for years, a crying need of women workers, in our city missions, our charitable institutions, and in our foreign mission-fields. After having had the matter under consideration for years, the Charities Association of the Synodical Conference at its convention at Fort Wayne last summer resolved to organize a Deaconess Association. This resolution was carried into effect when on August 17, 1919, a number of our Fort Wayne Lutherans organized the Lutheran Deaconess Association of the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America. The purpose of the Associa-

tion, as stated in its constitution, is, 'a) to educate and train Lutheran deaconesses for the care of the sick and the poor in the congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference and for the ministry of mercy in the charitable institutions and in the Home and Foreign Mission work of said Synodical Conference; b) to erect and maintain Lutheran deaconess schools, mother houses, and other institutions likely to promote the purposes of the association.' One of the first things to be done is to provide for a mother house, that is, a suitable building for the deaconess school and home." D.

### Why Not Parochial Schools?

The *Lutheran* (December 9, 1920) writes editorially on "The Pagan Menace" in our American system of education:—

"At a recent convention of the Philadelphia Sunday-school Association, expression was given to a general and growing conviction among Christians that we are face to face with the menace of paganism in our American system of education. One of the speakers advocated week-day religious instruction as a means of counteracting the menace. He said in part:

"In the last quarter of a century we have educated the child away from the Church — and the biggest offender has been the public school. The school says to the child five days a week: "The most important thing in your life is the school," and the child has believed it. For, opposed to those thirty hours a week, there has been up to the present time only one hour a week of religious training. It is our task to see that the child is brought to a realization that religion is just as much a part of the business of life as schooling."

"He called attention to a plan that has been tried in ten States, where cards are signed by the children's parents, entitling them to be excused from school during a certain period so as to attend a school of religious training conducted elsewhere. Such schools are being conducted in Toledo, O.; Grand Rapids, Mich.; Rochester, N. Y.; Hartford, Conn.; and Batavia, N. Y. We are not familiar with the plan or program as carried out in these cities, and hence cannot pass upon their merits. The question, however, arises as to whether these schools are as effective a solution of the problem as is called for, whether they go far enough.

"In the first place, the matter is of such supreme importance that the organized Church, rather than a society or association, should take hold of this matter and outline a plan or program that will be adequate and will be adopted generally. The Church as a whole must be impressed with the seriousness of the situation and with its own responsibility. It must function as a teaching agency itself, and not be satisfied to turn so important a work over to volunteer associations. The primal unit, which is the congregation, must be impressed with its responsibility and prepare itself to be a teaching as well as a preaching force. This idea lies back of the movement in New York City, which is about to be inaugurated; for there the religious school will be conducted in the various churches and not in some place away from them. The Roman Catholic Church will be sure to have its



congregational schools and may be counted upon to do things with a thoroughness and efficiency in its own way and along its own lines which is not characteristic of Protestants. This movement must be lodged in the congregation if it is to prove effective and lasting.

"In the next place, the Church must take this matter in hand seriously, and not resort to pageants and moving-picture methods to teach religion, as was advocated by one of the speakers. These may answer a useful purpose at long intervals; but teaching religion is serious business and should be so treated. The children must be taught and trained, and not simply be entertained. Our public school teachers do not resort to pageants and moving pictures to teach mathematics or grammar or history or geography. They assign lessons and expect the pupil to study and to get down to something definite. Is the study of these branches of more consequence, and do they deserve more earnest thought and attention than the great facts and truths of our Christianity? Do we mean to play with these truths and cheapen them in the eyes of the children by making them subjects for entertainment? That is one of the weaknesses of our Protestant Christianity, and is the reason why so many of the parents and the children refuse to take their religion seriously enough to know what they ought to believe and how they ought to live. The time has come to take hold of this whole question in a way that comports with its seriousness and importance."

D.

### The Language Question.

At its recent convention in Washington, D. C., the U. L. C. (United Lutheran Church) passed a series of fourteen resolutions outlining its linguistic policy in polyglot Lutheran America. Four of these resolutions state the principles, and ten the methods to be adopted. The gist of the whole matter is, that, the Gospel being cosmopolitan in scope, the ministry of the Gospel must be adapted linguistically to existing needs, and linguistic frictions must be avoided. The *Lutheran* (December 9, 1920) reprints these resolutions, and remarks editorially:—

"The Lutheran Church in this country has the unique distinction of being the only Church capable of preaching the Gospel in more than a dozen tongues. It is therefore in a position to do more effective Home Mission work among the fifteen different nationalities that have migrated from various parts of Europe where the Lutheran Church is strongly represented than any other American church-body. It has the ministers, it has the literature, it knows the habits and spirit and customs of this polyglot immigrant population. This population has been an inviting mission-field for the English-speaking denominations of other faiths, and not a few of them have schools preparing young men to minister in as high as five different tongues. They are most successful, however, in gathering the children and young people of these Lutheran immigrants into their folds.

"It is well to bear this in mind, since the cry for 'Americanization' has created a prejudice against the use of a foreign tongue in the teaching and preaching of religion. Many of the very best and most

loyal citizens in this country have suffered much because of this prejudice. This has been especially the case in those bodies where the German language is still in use. The zeal to decry a very natural and normal use of a foreign tongue has been not only un-American, but it has also been unchristian. There is no possible danger that any foreign tongue will ever become a rival to the adopted speech of the country, and there is no need of interfering with the personal liberty of any American citizen who wants the Gospel preached to him in any other language than English. A man's mother-tongue is the speech of his heart, and no law on earth can compel him to cease to love it, even though he may be able to speak a dozen other languages. It is his birthright to love the speech of his youth.

"An incident will show how vital is the principle that a man shall have the right to worship God in the language that appeals most to his heart. A Lutheran of foreign birth lay on his death-bed and desired the ministrations of a pastor. He understood English; but it was not the language of his heart. An English pastor ministered to him as best he could, but seemed to make little impression and got no satisfactory response. Later a pastor who was familiar with the dying man's native speech was summoned, and when he addressed him in his mother-tongue, his face lighted up, his eyes glistened with tears, and the response was most hearty. The pastor had quoted the Scriptures and the hymn, and had offered the prayer, in the language of his heart. Such incidents have by no means been rare, as many an English-speaking pastor capable of using another language can testify."

D.

#### "Choosing a Pastor."

Writing on this subject in the *Intelligencer* (November 24, 1920) Rev. W. D. Brown discounts the methods of "trial sermons" and of the "prospecting committee," which have no warrant in Scripture nor in the pure practise of the Church, and to which no self-respecting minister will submit. As a substitute the writer proposes the following plan, which embodies not a few features of the method followed among us:—

"In going about the selection of a new pastor, why not pursue some such method as the Board of Foreign Missions use in accepting candidates for the foreign field? How would it be to consult the man's record a little more and place less reliance on his facility in preaching his best sermon, when he comes as a candidate? How would it be to find out how he has done his work in college and seminary, and what was his rating there? In other words, is there not some merit in a plan like this:—Let a committee of the Consistory find out the facts of a man's early life, date and place of birth, parents' name and occupation, health of the candidate, and his tendencies to disease, if any. Where did he obtain and what was the character of his education? What was his rating in college and seminary? Get a confidential letter on these subjects from the president of the institution where he studied or from one or two of the professors with whom he took work.

"Then go into his record as a pastor. With what churches has



he served since his ordination? What degree of success did he have in his charges? Did the churches under his care experience any unusual feature in the material or spiritual aspect of their life? Was there harmony or discord? If the latter, before dismissing the consideration of the man, try to discover if it was not due to disturbing elements which sometimes find their way into a congregation for no fault of the pastor. If the work on these fields is only ordinary, again before dismissing the consideration of him, try to discover if the apparent lack of results may not be due to the difficult conditions under which he labored.

"Get an estimate of him from at least two or three persons in the locality in which he has lived. Be satisfied that he is a man demanded by the times in which we live.

"In saying all this, the writer is assuming that the candidate has been found to be a man of God, true to the Scriptures, abiding in faith, strong in prayer, and a Christian optimist.

"And then, be assured that this is a very much better basis for estimating a man than you ever could have by hearing him preach once or twice, or even three times."

Some of these suggestions, like that relating to the candidate's pedigree, seem unessential and irrelevant. The results of most of the inquiries suggested can be misconstrued. But a good suggestion is that the advice of competent judges should be sought, and the candidate's quality of workmanship considered. Any candidate that meets the requirements mentioned in the second-last paragraph is eligible for 90 per cent. of the positions that may have to be filled within the Church. D.

### American Legion and Red Cross.

On these two organizations the *Nation* (December 8, 1920) expresses an opinion that would have been contraband not so very long ago. The Knights of Columbus are contemplating donating the unexpended balance of their war moneys, some \$5,000,000, to the American Legion for a costly home in Washington, D. C. Deprecating this, the *Nation* says editorially:—

"The American Legion itself is still a questionable thing. It is by no means clear whether it will become a menace to the country or a source of pride and an organization of great usefulness. Again, it is a rapidly shrinking body; at its last convention in Cleveland the press reports gave it only about 800,000 paid-up members, as against the original 3,000,000. To beseech an organization which has up to this time proved prejudiced, opinionated, and reactionary, whose future is not even certain, to overcome its great reluctance to accept this great sum is surely folly. Far better use for it would be the starting of a new Red Cross, a White Cross, or a Green Cross, to assume the neutral, international position Clara Barton planned for the now Government-prostituted Red Cross."

If the Legion should accept the Knights' donation, it will become still more firmly chained to the Roman chariot than by the election of its first national chaplain. D.

### Tests of Americanism.

Says the *Nation* (December 8, 1920): "There have been many acid tests of American purpose in the War, but none more clearly such than our treatment of the handful of Americans who were not too proud, but were too brave to fight, who unflinchingly faced and suffered hatred, ostracism, imprisonment, physical torture, and death for their faith. These four thousand, out of the four million called to arms, who resisted every form of pressure to make them fight were possessed of a courage beyond the understanding of the mob. The coward would have backed down. The slacker would have done what indeed thousands of his brand, like the notorious Bergdolls, did—evaded registration or even more safely joined in the scramble for places in non-combatant services within the army itself. No, the true conscientious objectors to whom we refer were not dodgers. They were above all things facers. And as time goes on, and the already receding tide of hysteria and hate ebbs, there will come, along with the realization of the ghastly futility and madness of war, a clearer recognition of the pioneer courage and heroic martyrdom of these men. And while they suffered greatly, their sacrifice is not in vain.

"To those familiar with war psychology it is not surprising that the least belligerent, the least endangered, and the supposedly freest country involved should have traveled the furthest in the severity of its punishment of all forms of dissent. In other countries conscientious objectors were imprisoned, but their terms were short and obviously intended for restraint only during the period of hostilities. They were released soon after the armistice. But in free America not only was the imprisonment needlessly prolonged for over two years,—longer than the terms given the few notorious enemy conspirators found guilty of plotting murder against our civilian population,—but the incarceration was accompanied by unspeakable atrocities. A number died in prison, victims of beating and deliberate starvation. Others were tied up by the hands for days at a time, drenched in icy water, and compelled to remain in cells at freezing temperatures. A number of these died from pneumonia. Nor did the indignities cease with death. The wife of one religious objector, member of a sect professedly opposed to all forms of violence, coming to claim his body, found it clad in the uniform which he had given his life to avoid donning. Instances of that kind were innumerable. The iron cage of Alcatraz, especially constructed for the torture of the conscientious objectors, an instrument recalling the medieval Iron Maiden, is the symbol of America's treatment of them and entitled as such to a place in our historical museum as a warning to coming generations. It is important that they should have this warning. The Civil Liberties Union which has done such splendid work in agitating for the mitigation of the suffering and the ultimate release of the objectors would be eminently fitted to assume this responsibility. . . . Other groups of men are still behind prison bars, victims of our ruthlessness. There are the soldiers, many of them boys, many of them volunteers, who, thrust from the unrestraint of American farm or city life into the rigid discipline of army and navy, were guilty of various infractions



of discipline. Courtmartialed for 'disrespect' to a minor commissioned officer often totally unworthy to command, some are still serving the ferocious sentences imposed to convince the world that we were at war. . . . And there is Debs and a few others like him who would not be stampeded, who refused to hate, who obeyed the Biblical injunction to 'resist not evil,' who, like Martin Luther, stood by their principles, and 'could do no other.'

"Well, the War has been over for two years and more. Who now dares assert that it was not the greatest failure in history? Who will deny that by it civilization is immeasurably set back? And who can assert that those who, before the shattering and revealing experiences of the last five years, saw clearly and so did move, were not at least as true patriots and humanitarians as the other millions, and better prophets?"

D.

### Reverend Promoters of Peace and War.

A curious phenomenon witnessed in our country is thus analyzed by the *Nation* (December 8, 1920):

"Any one returning to the United States after a long absence might be much impressed by the enthusiasm of clergymen and social uplifters for the League of Nations. Surely, he would argue, there is a genuine moral issue involved when such men and women declare themselves so vigorously for a League of Peace. Whether on further consideration he would share the enthusiasm which at first so impressed him is open to doubt; he certainly would not if his attention were called to a circumstance that has had too little attention. It is this: The clergymen and other moral leaders who have diligently exhorted their fellow-countrymen on the subject of the League of Nations as the way to righteousness and peace, have been for the most part silent on the obvious and indisputable moral issues of our time. They have said nothing about our ruthless imperialism in Haiti, nothing about the administration's private wars in Russia, its aid to Poland, its part in the blockade of Russia, which still is costing the lives of unnumbered thousands of men and women and little children. They have been dumb before the sacking of Irish towns, pogroms in Belfast, and the death of hunger-strikers; yet these things imperil the peace of the whole world. They have seen civil liberties ridden over rough shod by Secretaries Burleson and Palmer, and they have held their peace. They have not denounced the continued imprisonment of conscientious objectors and political heretics. They have been silent in face of the institution of the Czaristic system of espionage and repression by Federal, State, and municipal officials. These facts are indisputable. They are matters of record. Why should our clergymen show so profound a concern for the League of Nations, which at best is a debatable issue, when they make no public or concerted efforts to right open and palpable wrongs?

"One ventures to guess that the answer lies in the realm of psychology. Those who now valiantly support the League of Nations are the same protagonists of the War on moral grounds. In season and out of season they proclaim a holy war to end war, to save the

soul of America, make the world safe for democracy, and establish the rights of the weak and oppressed. They, following the lead of that greatest preacher of them all, Woodrow Wilson, sought to make the World War, which was essentially a contest between rival imperialisms, a crusade greater than Peter the Hermit ever preached. Behold the result: Misery, hunger, unrest, hate, disillusionment. Never was nationalist, race, or class feeling higher. Armaments increase. New economic rivalries already divide the Allies. No sane man dreams that any one of the fundamental "moral" aims of the war has already been achieved. Literally the only vestige of justification for the protagonists of the holy war is the League of Nations. Few men are clear-sighted enough or possess the moral courage requisite for the admission that all their hopes were vain, and that we must take a new start to build a lasting peace. It is not merely the opinion of others that preachers and moral leaders have to fear, but the loss of their own self-confidence. To admit the falsity of their hopes or the failure of their methods would be a crushing blow to the inner citadel of their being. The League of Nations must be the ark of their salvation else they are utterly shipwrecked in stormy seas. They believe because every instinct of their being demands that they believe — and without question.

"One thing that makes this process easier for churchmen is that they are trained in accepting verbal solutions without too nice regard for realities. The whole process of theological readjustment which has enabled modern men to adapt themselves more or less comfortably to medieval creeds — valuable as in many ways it has been — has its obverse side. It makes for a clever casuistry rather than for down-right mental integrity. It has trained men in the art of seeing how much one can say without saying too much. On the ethical side the fault of theological education is even more pronounced. Preachers are trained to speak phrases with regard to righteousness and justice which they do not interpret in concrete terms. No man can make these theological and ethical compromises in the pulpit without in time becoming himself far more expert in handling phrases than realities. He solves the old difficulty of putting new wine in old bottles by using not wine at all, but only grape juice. And he himself doesn't know the difference.

"But back of this faulty education lies something deeper. The main business of the liberal is to find an easy way to solve problems. He will do anything for peace except remove the economic causes of war. No one who studies the way economic interest, playing upon mob psychology, produces war, can believe in any cure for war that does not involve spiritual and economic revolution, the abolition of privilege, and the end of the whole psychology of domination. War is a cancer in the body politic. The League of Nations is a mere poultice for it. This fact your liberal finds it hard to face. For much is at stake. It is comfortable, safe, and morally edifying for the preacher to support the League of Nations. But to denounce economic imperialism, to champion Haiti and Russia, to defend the prisoner of conscience, and the right of free speech — that's another matter. It



is not very comfortable and in many cases far from safe. Of course, all this is not explicit in the minds of the excellent people who champion the League. Nevertheless, it remains true that the explanation of the concern of ministers, ecclesiastical bodies, and miscellaneous liberals for the League of Nations and their indifference to far more obvious moral issues can only be found in an analysis of the motives and interests which far more than reason sway the acts of men." D.

### Germans That Deserve No Pity.

The *Koelnische Zeitung* (weekly edition, December 8, 1920) calls attention to a danger created by Germans for the charities that are enlisted in behalf of starving Germany. Statistics recently published show that the consumption of costly wines, especially champagne, has enormously increased among a certain class of Germans. At the late races at Hamburg this element was greatly in evidence by their prodigality, high betting, and sumptuous living. British papers like the *London Globe* (intensely hostile to Germany) and the *Manchester Guardian* (more sane and reasonable) canvass these reports, and the effect can easily be foreseen: the innocent will be made to suffer. The Germans in question are people who have become suddenly rich through the war, not infrequently by illicit practises. The *Koelnische Zeitung* speaks of "Schleicher und Schieber," men who have smuggled and peddled goods, and have exploited the national misery of Germany by raising the prices for necessities enormously. The revolution has made some of them socially and politically prominent. They are no representatives of the Germany that is silently suffering, or appealing to the active sympathy of the charitable part of mankind. They are a public nuisance, a moral plague, and should be sternly dealt with by the German government. Meanwhile the charitable activities that have been started to help a crushed people that is struggling to get on its feet should be continued. The truly needy Germans are no myth; and these will be reached. D.

### The "Variorum" Bible.

A plea is being made—rightfully, we think!—to reviewers of the life-work of the late Canon Sanday not to forget "the great service which he rendered to Bible students of a generation ago. In collaboration with Professors Cheyne and Driver, and other scholars, he produced what afterwards came to be known as the *Variorum Bible*—an edition of the Authorized Version, with notes supplying various renderings and readings from the best authorities. Brought out by the King's Printers, this Bible proved of immense service to careful students of Holy Scripture, and to this day it embodies the devoted labor of men who were content to elucidate the text rather than, as afterwards proved to be the case, qualifying its authority by the application of critical theories of a destructive order." D.

---

## BOOK REVIEW.

*Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis:—*

1. **The Family Altar.** *Rev. F. W. Herzberger.* 375 pages. \$2.50.

A fine spirit of Christian cheerfulness and pastoral cordiality seems to us, from a partial perusal, to be a distinctive feature of these helps for the leader in family prayer in our hustling twentieth-century life, which demands that the "sweet hour of prayer" be reduced to two minutes and four and a half seconds, with a tendency to cut off the half second. With the majority of us it will be either a book like this, or nothing at all. So we are glad we have this book, and are assured that its good selection of texts and the appealing tone of the remarks on the texts will prove a spiritual blessing to our home-life. D.

2. **Select Songs for School and Home.** Compiled by *J. A. Theiss.* With an Introduction on the Rudiments of Music by *Karl Haase.* XVI and 229 pages. \$1.50.

We neither read our Bible, nor pray, nor join in singing Christian songs as we used to at our homes. Zion's children ought to be a band of singers. They are people that have a right to sing, and that have something to sing that is worth while. This book will aid our schools in the singing lesson, but by its aid we can also fill our homes with sweet melodies of grace and cheer. D.

*Success Printing Co., St. Louis,* has published a pretty number in its "Jesu Juengerschafts Serie": Nr. 5: **Pastor Frommholds Soehne.** D.

*Geo. H. Doran Company, New York:—*

- Contending for the Faith.** Essays in Constructive Criticism and Positive Apologetics. *Leander S. Keyser, D. D.* 351 pages. Cloth, 12mo. \$3.00, net.

Dr. Leander S. Keyser, Professor of Systematic Theology in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, O. (Merger), has earned himself an enviable reputation by a series of volumes which have stirred up more than usual interest. Himself harassed with doubt in his earlier years, Dr. Keyser has become a vigorous defender of the faith "once delivered," which, also in the present volume, he vindicates with great thoroughness and convincing logic. The book contains fifteen chapters, in which the author grips the Higher Critics, and exposes their insidious sleights and cunning devices, showing how unfair, illogical, and illiberal are the claims by which destructive critics support their suppositions. There are chapters on The Nature and Need of Apologetics, A Liberal Critic's (Dr. S. R. Driver's) View of Biblical Inspiration, The Old Testament Religion: Revelation or Evolution? The Moral Character of the Old Testament Jehovah, The Jehovah of the Old Testament, The Book of Jonah: Fact or Fiction, Legend or History? Christ's Witness to the Old Testament, The Bible a Book of Religion—and More, Thoughts on the Incarnation, God, and Immortality, A Criticism on Evolution, and lastly, Scientific Theories that Challenge Faith. To these essays are added a comprehensive bibliography and a good, exhaustive index. In the above chapters the writer touches upon almost every vital doctrine of theology—The Holy

Trinity, Creation, Inspiration, Christ's Deity and Incarnation, Atonement, Miracles, etc., condensing in their comparatively narrow scope an immense amount of reading, research, and learning, and setting forth with remarkable clearness both thesis and antithesis. Throughout the essays are characterized by sound scholarship and literary excellence, although it goes without saying that one cannot subscribe to every statement made in the book. The author's estimate as regards the fruits of apologetics is perhaps too high. To say, "We are constrained to hold from our study of church history, that Christianity would long ago have perished from the earth, had not brave, stalwart, and competent defenders of the evangelical faith always arisen to stay 'the onslaughts of assailants'" (p. 15), really places apologetics above the positive preaching of the Gospel, which is the true means by which the Savior keeps and spreads His Church on earth. On p. 108 sqq. the author himself admits that the very men who need apologetic literature most pay little attention to the works of conservative scholars, which bears out the historic fact that very few people are won for Christ "by refuting argument with stronger argument, matching scholarship with scholarship, and thus vindicating the Christian faith at the bar of reason" (p. 15). Also it requires more than the usual amount of intelligence to find through the author's own views on evolution. On page 307 the author states: "We think that the simple Bible way is the most rational—that in six days or periods (*sic?*) God created and unfolded the universe to its present condition." Also the writer denounces the use of the word "evolution," since it has come to have "an indeterminate and overelastic use." (p. 302.) For "evolution" the word "development" is suggested, plus "creation" and "miracle." However, "Let the word 'development' stand to describe all the *gradual* processes that the divine Being employs in *carrying forward the movement of the creation*." (Italics our own.) We ask, Which are the gradual processes that carry forward the movement of the creation? Again: "The word 'development' has not been used like 'evolution' to describe a forward movement merely by means of *resident forces*, and therefore can include *unfolding by means of such forces*, if God wills." Again: "But if there is teleology in nature, there must be a Mind back of nature which *pushes her forward along the line of progress*." (p. 296.) Again: "We cannot and will not deny that in the *geological ages* there was a movement from the lower to the higher stages of existence. . . . That this general law of upward movement prevailed in the remote *prehistoric past* no one would be so foolish as to deny." (p. 306.) The author throughout the chapter denies the claims of "naturalistic evolution" by means of "resident forces" as unreasonable. Yet, while he, too, denounces the term "theistic evolution" as a contradiction, he states, "No one will deny that in *prehistoric times* there is evidence in both the Bible and science that the world *was being prepared progressively*." (p. 306.) Is not this the precise view of mediating scholars who employ the term "theistic evolution"? Ought a brave, stalwart, and competent defender of the evangelical faith write such sentences and make such concessions in the very act of "defending the faith"?

However, while taking issue with the author on these points, the general and enthusiastic recommendations accorded Dr. Keyser's new



volume are well deserved. For pastors, teachers, and educated laymen who wish to acquaint themselves with the maneuvers of destructive critics, and who are looking for a straight, unqualified, and convincing refutation of their claims, the book in general will prove very serviceable. The almost universal dissemination of liberal views by means of dailies, periodicals, and other agencies of the press demands that at least those who teach the faith should know what insidious onslaughts are made by latitudinarian assailants, and they will thank the author for having given them so timely and needful a help.

MUELLER.

*The Macmillan Company, New York:—*

**Theology as an Empirical Science.** Douglas Clyde Macintosh, Ph. D.  
270 pages.

The Dwight Professor of Theology in Yale University attempts in this volume to dislocate theology from its isolated position in the domain of human knowledge, to contribute towards the fulfilment of the hope of William James that empiricism associated with religion will begin a new era of religion, and to produce a theology that would win the approbation of Huxley because it "rests upon valid evidence and sound reasoning." His theological empiricist is "free from any bondage to external traditional authority." The crucial problems for a scientific theology which he seeks to solve are the following:—

(1) Is there *religious perception*, or something in the religious realm corresponding to perception, *viz.*, cognition of the divine as revealed within the field of human experience? (2) Is it possible to formulate, on this basis of the data made available in religious experience, *theological laws*, or generalizations as to what the Divine Being does on the fulfilment of certain discoverable conditions? (3) Can *theological theory* be constructed in a scientific manner upon the basis of these laws?

The process will develop as follows:—

The definitions with which an empirical science begins are very different from those which enter into abstract, deductive sciences. In the abstract or hypothetical sciences the definitions are complete from the beginning, and must be held unchanged throughout the whole process of deduction. The definitions in geometry, for example, are of this sort. In the empirical or inductive sciences, however, it is different. These proceed "from the vague whole to the definite whole." They construct their definitions *a posteriori*. The initial definitions are merely formal and provisional; they must be sufficient simply to mark off from all other objects the particular objects to be investigated, and it is the central aim of the science to learn from experience what further content to put within these preliminary formal definitions. Thus chemistry's initial definition of matter, biology's initial definition of life, psychology's initial definition of mind or consciousness, and sociology's initial definition of society need only be sufficiently explicit for the identification of the objects to be studied. The definition grows as the science proceeds; detailed knowledge of the object is the end, not the beginning, of the science. And it is not different in empirical theology. Here the most important definition is that of God. The science should begin with some formal definition of God, as the ultimate Object of religious dependence, or the Source of religious deliverance. Then it must proceed to find out from religious experience more particularly just what attributes and relations can be ascribed to that religious Object.

In addition, theology as an empirical science will assume, or presuppose, "as a working hypothesis to be tested by experiment and observation,"

anything of which man already has practical certainty, *e. g.*, 1. in general, the laws of thought and the assumptions common to all scientific investigations of an empirical sort, embracing also the pertinent and well-established results of other empirical sciences; 2. in particular, human free agency, the possibility of immortality, the fact of sin; 3. the element peculiar to theology: the existence of God. As a specimen of the operation of empiricism in theology we may take the concept of guilt.

Defining intention as the idea of all the consequences expected to follow from the act, and consented to, whether willingly or reluctantly, in deciding to perform it, it is easily seen that, other things being equal, guilt for a wrong action varies directly as the evil intention (EI) and inversely as the good intention (GI). Motive being the idea of the expected consequence for the sake of which the act is decided upon, guilt is seen to vary again directly as the evil motive (EM) and inversely as the good motive (GM). "Good" and "evil" in these instances are determined, of course, by means of the idea of the greatest possible genuine good, or well-being, of all persons. Sometimes there is little actual foresight of consequences, but if the action is wrong, the guilt varies directly as the possible foresight (PF), and also directly as the signs of the desirability (SD) of gaining further knowledge of consequences. In these two factors are included both the accessibility of the facts and the native sagacity of the agent. Again, if the wrong act is committed against good instincts (gi), or inherited impulses, the guilt is greater; if in accord with evil instincts (ei), it is, other things being equal, less. Similarly, if the wrong act is committed in opposition to the good mores (gm), or customary morality of the community, the doer is the more guilty on that account; if in harmony with the evil mores (em), he is the less guilty. Again, if the wrong deed is committed against good habits unconsciously formed (GHU), the guilt is greater; if in accord with evil habits unconsciously formed (EHU), it is less. But if committed in accord with evil habits consciously formed (EHC), or against good habits consciously formed (GHC), the case is somewhat ambiguous. Because he acts according to habit, he seems less guilty; but, because the habit was consciously formed, more guilty if the habit was bad, and deserving credit in the light of the past if the habit was good. The solution of the problem is found in deciding whether to judge the single act, or, as is now approved in scientific penology, to judge the *man* for this act, but in the light of his whole relevant record. In the former case, *i. e.*, judging the single act, we should have to say that the guilt was greater, according as there was a good habit, making it easier to avoid the wrong act; or that the guilt was less, according as there was an evil habit, making it hard to avoid the evil act. But in judging the man in the act instead of the act in its isolation we should have to say that the guilt was greater in view of the underlying evil habit having been consciously formed, but that it would have been less if it had taken place in spite of habitual good action in this connection in the past. There remains the social factor, or temptation, to be considered. Using the term broadly, so as to include social pressure, or temptation, toward good as well as toward evil, we should have to make the following distinctions: the guilt is greater according as the wrong act is committed against temptation toward good, if this social influence came unsought (GTU); but less, if in accord with temptation to evil, coming unsought (ETU). Again, having sought temptation to evil (ETS), leaves the man, judged for the act, but in the light of its antecedents, the more guilty; while having sought temptation to good (GTS) leaves the man, in view of his record, the less guilty. But if it be insisted that the final wrong act alone be judged in its isolation, we may say that the *additional* guilt incurred by one who yields to a temptation which he was previously induced, whether by inner or outer pressure, to seek, is less in view of this seeking. But in the case of one who commits the wrong by turning in the opposite direction to that in which he was going just before, when he was



seeking good social influences, the *additional* guilt incurred by the final act is greater by reason of this sudden lapse from good.

The results of our analysis of the chief factors that enter into guilt, or responsibility for wrong conduct, may then be set forth in the two following diagrams, the former of which represents the judgment to be passed upon the isolated wrong act, and the latter that to be passed upon the man as a whole, in view of this last wrong action. The numerator of the fraction represents in each case the factors according to which the guilt varies directly, and the denominator the factors according to which it varies inversely.

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| (1) | (EI) . (EM) . (PF) . (SD) . (gi) . (gm) . (GHU) . (GHC) . (GTU) . (GTS)                  |
|     | (GI) . (GM) <span style="float:right">(ei) . (em) . (EHU) . (EHC) . (ETU) . (ETS)</span> |
| (2) | (EI) . (EM) . (PF) . (SD) . (gi) . (gm) . (GHU) . (EHC) . (GTU) . (ETS)                  |
|     | (GI) . (GM) <span style="float:right">(ei) . (em) . (EHU) . (GHC) . (ETU) . (GTS)</span> |

The author has related his studies to such scientific theologians as Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Nietzsche, Kaftan, Wobbermin. His book shows plainly the unbridgeable gulf between the theology which starts with the *a priori* belief in the Bible as God's Word and makes its parole: *Ne ultra Scripturam!* and empiricism.

D.

**A Reel of Rainbow.** By *F. W. Boreham*. The Abingdon Press, Cincinnati, O. 207 pp., 5×7½. Price, \$1.75.

The eighteen essays of Rev. Boreham contained in this volume maintain the author's reputation for original and epigrammatic treatment of topics related to every-day life. Slight, gauze-like in texture, the beauty and richness of treatment carry the reader along, charming him with their exquisite style and their continual surprises in the way of application and illustration. Relying upon the reputation of the writer, the publishers have set an exorbitant price upon the book.

GRAEBNER.

**The Religion of Judah.** By *John Bayne Ascham*. The Abingdon Press, Cincinnati, O. 296 pp., 5×7½. Price, \$1.50; postage, 10 cts. extra.

What we remarked about the companion volume to this work, *The Religion of Israel*, applies to *The Religion of Judah*. It is a popularization of the results of negative Higher Criticism, intended for use in Bible Study classes. In spite of all that has been written in demonstration of the fallacies of the "documentary" hypothesis by Hommel, James Robertson, Cave, Urquhart, Sayce, the authors of *Lex Mosaica*, Redpath, Green, Hilprecht, Clay, Warfield, Robt. D. Wilson, Wiener, Bartlett, McGarvey, Orr, and many more, the late origin of Deuteronomy and of much else in the Mosaic legislation, of the Book of Daniel, of "Deutero-Isaiah," etc., are taken for granted, and the entire treatment of the subject matter rests upon an acceptance of the naturalistic reconstruction of the Old Testament books and teachings. All references for collateral reading are to critical works of the extreme negative school. A disheartening and destructive book, which calls to mind the words Is. 29, 16: "Surely your turning things upside down shall be esteemed as the potter's clay!"

GRAEBNER.

**A Religious Revolution and Its Consequences.** By *John Horsch*. Fundamental Truth Depot, Scottdale, Pa. 16 pp., 5¼×7¾. Price, 15 cts.

This is the first number in a series of pamphlets designed to give information concerning modern liberalism or the "new theology," more particu-



larly, to set forth the destructive tendencies and unreasonableness of the modern religious liberalism. The number before us gives promise of a valuable series. We hope that in the forthcoming numbers the author will continue to give volume and page for his quotations from the infidels who now are speaking for a great part of the Christian Church. The entire series of 21 numbers, treating such subjects as Inspiration, the Deity of Christ, the Social Gospel, Immortality, Evolutionism, will be sold to ministers direct for \$2.45.

GRAEBNER.

*Edwin Runge, Berlin-Lichterfelde, Germany:—*

**Christliche Glaubenslehre.** Von *Ludwig Lemme*. 2 vols. VI and 375, and IV and 343 pages; paper cover. M. 46.

Noting the existing "dogmatic confusion," which is worse than any that has occurred at any previous time, and is caused by the tension between the psychological and rational elements in the Christian religion, on the one hand, and the historical elements, on the other, the author designates the position occupied by himself in the dogmatic Babel: "Never have I adhered to any one school or regarded myself as belonging to one. However, no person can avoid a historic connection. And if this continuity is asked for in my instance, the names of J. A. Dorner and H. Martensen define the line which I am conscious of continuing, because I regard as indispensable for dogmatics the connection of the empiricism of faith and speculation represented by these two men, who were equally prominent in a religio-ethical and a scientific respect. I am, indeed, of the opinion that (under the influence of the idealistic philosophy, especially of Schelling) both were in error in telescoping both tasks (the ethico-religious and the scientific), and thus assigning to speculation a preponderating importance which does not belong to it. In the clear division of the two, both in dogmatics and apologetics, I behold the necessary systematic progress which must be achieved if elements of Christian theology that cannot be surrendered are not to be exposed to the danger of dying or at least of withering. In this respect I know myself to be of a kindred mind—though in an entirely independent manner—with Richard Rothe, who not only secured independence to practical religiousness over and against all dogmatism, but also demanded home rights in theology for speculation which cannot be abandoned at all as long as there are speculative dogmas. However, owing to his dependence upon Hegel's philosophy, he was on a wrong path in assigning to the speculative task the first place in the organism of the theological disciplines, and thereby placing theology in a false dependence upon metaphysical thought-operations. The first place belongs to the great reality of historical Christianity, as it gains religious form in the experience of faith; only in a secondary respect, and starting from this religious basis, the task of the thinker is directed to the end of certifying the absolutism of Christianity by proving the truth of the Christian conviction of faith. For, although I esteem philosophy highly, I champion decidedly the complete independence of theology from philosophy. Passing over Hofmann, who was under the strong influence of Schelling and the still stronger influence of Hegel, the Erlangen theology has endeavored to keep itself free from philosophical influences. It took over



from Schleiermacher the principle of the experience of faith, and made an attempt to work into it the speculative dogma, which, by virtue of this principle of Schleiermacher, was, and had to be, excluded. An impossible attempt!" etc. This self-characterization may not be very illuminating to us. (We ask forgiveness for our conceit, if we say it sounds better in English than in the original German.) The test of the author's dogmatic quality comes to us when we see his standpoint on distinct teachings, and as Lutherans we are interested to know how he relates himself to Luther and the Lutheran dogmaticians after Luther. To note this last relation first, the author asserts for Luther a far greater influence on systematic theology than he is usually credited with; justifying faith was with Luther the determining principle for all doctrines and the light in which they must be studied. But this, we are told, does not mean that in Luther's view everything sprang from justifying faith. Luther was standing on a basis of traditionalism rather than of justifying faith; he cast off such parts of tradition as contradicted his own religious experience and seemed to him contrary to reason. (p. 65.) Melancthon the author regards as an inferior dogmatician, because by the type of doctrine which he offered in the later editions of his *Loci* he led the way in making out of Lutheran Protestantism a didactic pastors' church (*eine lehrhafte Pastorenkirche*), and because he was intolerant, declaring even slight deviations in doctrine as hazards to salvation. (p. 66 f.) In the Era of Orthodoxy the author admires the exact learning and the intellectual feats of the dogmaticians, but scores the intellectualistic stubbornness shown in the fanatical insistence on doctrinal definitions of men like Calov. (p. 74.) We note a few doctrinal judgments of the author: "The doctrine of the verbal inspiration, that is, of the theory that the real author of the Holy Scriptures (*auctor primarius*) is the Holy Spirit (resp., the Triune God), while the writers (*amanuenses, tabelliones, notarii*) were, so to speak, merely the pens (*calami Spiritus S.*), has from a scientific standpoint been dispatched (*abgetan*) long ago: as equally contradictory to the doctrine of God and to psychology." (II, 148.) "The positive value of the doctrine of the two natures [in Christ] lies in the fact that by means of it there is guarded in Christology what is indispensable for maintaining salvation, viz., that in Jesus Christ there must be a content essentially divine if He is to elevate men to a holy spirit-life, and that Jesus Christ must be true man in order to be of any value or benefit to men." (I, 346.) "A juridical *anti hemon*, such as the theory of the satisfaction and the doctrine of the substitutive punitive suffering [of Christ], is unknown to the New Testament, according to which Christ has done all and suffered all *hyper hemon*, hence, for our benefit. As regards the idea that Christ died in our place so that we do not have to die any more, the New Testament teaches the very opposite, namely, that in the death of Christ the death of all who believe in Him is included (2 Cor. 5, 14. 15)." (II, 25.) Lack of space forbids further notices. Throughout his treatise the author notes the Latin terminology of the old dogmaticians, and the extent of his reading is immense. He will have to be classified with the modernists, who still have a strong leaning, as they imagine, to positivism, though they have broken with the old orthodox theories, e. g., of Philippi (ep. II, 25). D.